



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/677,002	10/01/2003	Sunny K. Yee	200207281-1	7239
22879	7590	04/18/2008	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY			HILLERY, NATHAN	
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION				
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			2176	
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/18/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM  
mkraft@hp.com  
ipa.mail@hp.com



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/677,002

Filing Date: October 01, 2003

Appellant(s): YEE ET AL.

---

Tait R. Swanson  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 1/14/08 appealing from the Office action mailed 6/7/07.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS**

The following grounds of rejection are not presented for review on appeal because they have been withdrawn by the examiner. Claims 8 – 14, are no longer rejected under 35 USC 101.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

#### **(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

20010044809

Parasnisi et al.

11-2001

## **(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1 – 7, 15 – 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1 – 7, 15 – 23 are considered software per se. Computer programs may be explicitly claimed as, for example, a series of code or instructions for performing functions or may be implicitly claimed as, for example, a system, a module or an apparatus, both being the case here in the form of systems and programs.

Thus a claim to functional descriptive material, including computer programs, per se, is not patent eligible subject matter. It should be noted that functional descriptive material claimed in combination with an appropriate computer storage medium to enable the functionality to be realized is patent eligible subject matter if it is capable of producing a useful, concrete and tangible result when used in the computer system.

Further, to expedite a complete examination of the instant application the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 (nonstatutory) above are further rejected as set forth below in anticipation of appellant amending these claims to make them statutory.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 – 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Parasnisi et al. (US 20010044809 A1).

**Regarding independent claim 1,** Parasnisi et al. teach that an exemplary system for implementing the present invention includes a conventional PC 20, including a system bus 23 that couples various system components to processing unit 21. System bus 23 may be a memory controller using any of a variety of bus architectures. Hard disk drive 27, magnetic disk drive 28, and optical disk drive 30 are connected to system bus 23. The drives and their associated computer-readable media provide nonvolatile storage of computer readable instructions, data structures, program modules, and other data for PC 20 (paragraph block 0022), which meet the limitation of **a controller generator that is adapted to provide an application with a controller that receives requests for data from users and responds to the requests by obtaining requested data.**

Parasnisi et al. teach that when the markup language documents are rendered by the browser, display pages are produced containing localized objects that convey content in the language selected by the user (paragraph block 0008), which meet the

**limitation of a page localization generator that is adapted to select a localized page based on at least one locale parameter.**

**Regarding dependent claim 2,** Parasnis et al. teach that the lobby pages of FIGS. 2 and 3 are rendered in response to the user selecting English and German for the UI language, respectively (paragraph block 0036), which meet the limitation of **the locale parameter comprises a language identifier.**

**Regarding dependent claim 3,** Parasnis et al. teach that English lobby page 100 can be rendered in one of several different languages. Suppose that a German company would like to perform a presentation broadcast. Accordingly, the labels and other information on the lobby page should be rendered in the German language. A German lobby page 100' corresponding to English lobby page 100 is shown in FIG. 3 and includes objects that have been rendered in German (paragraph block 0035), which meet the limitation of **the locale parameter comprises a country identifier.**

**Regarding dependent claims 4 and 5,** Parasnis et al. teach that many of today's software application programs are distributed in different versions that support various different languages. For example, Microsoft Corporation's word processing application program is used throughout the world, and is distributed in versions that support one of a myriad of different languages as well as various dialects (paragraph

block 0002), which meet the limitation of **the locale parameter comprises a locale variant and the locale variant comprises a language dialect identifier.**

**Regarding dependent claim 6,** Parasnis et al. teach that as discussed above, many application programs are published in different language versions. POWERPOINT 2000™ also provides support for different languages, but does so by using the present invention. The present invention enables an HTML-based UI to support a plurality of different languages using just a single set of HTML documents (one for each page required) (paragraph block 0034), which meet the limitation of **the page localization generator comprises an action mapping correlating each localized page of a plurality of different locale-versions of a page to the at least one locale parameter associated with each localized page.**

**Regarding dependent claim 7,** Parasnis et al. teach that an HTML document is created so as to include a plurality of placeholder values corresponding to text, graphic, and/or media objects that are to be rendered in a specified language when the HTML document is displayed by a browser, to produce the UI page (paragraph block 0036), which meet the limitation of **a model and a view separate from one another and separate from the controller, wherein the model is adapted to provide an application state for the application and the view is adapted to provide a view presentation for the application.** It should be noted that the HTML page with

placeholders is equivalent to the claimed model and the rendered UI page is equivalent to the claimed view.

**Regarding independent claims 8, 15, 18, and 19,** the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claim 1, and are rejected along the same rationale.

**Regarding dependent claims 9 – 11, 16, and 20,** the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claim 6, and are rejected along the same rationale.

**Regarding dependent claim 12,** Parasnis et al. teach that in particular, lines 60-61 of 1\_status.htm reference an UPDATE\_MESG placeholder value that is replaced as defined in a line 23 of global.js (English). In a similar manner with respect to German lobby page 100' (see FIG. 6), the UPDATE\_MESG placeholder value in 1\_status.htm is replaced as defined in a line 23 of global.js (German) (paragraph block 0047), which meet the limitation of **providing the page localization manager comprises providing a filename format having a basename and at least one locale-identifying extension to the basename.**

**Regarding dependent claim 13,** Parasnis et al. teach that the global.js reference file comprises a plurality of name-value pairs that link objects referenced in

the HTML document to localized objects. During a pre-rendering operation of the HTML document (e.g., when the HTML document is initially loaded by a browser), the placeholder values in the HTML document are replaced with localized objects based on the name-value pairs in the global.js reference file, as provided by a block 158 (paragraph block 0036), which meet the limitation of **providing the page localization manager comprises providing a layout mapping that identifies a locale-version of a layout for the requested page from a plurality of localized layouts.**

**Regarding dependent claim 14,** Parasnis et al. teach that as with the lobby.htm, 1\_status.htm includes JavaScript to link placeholder values in 1\_status.htm with localized values through the use of global.js. In particular, lines 60-61 of 1\_status.htm reference a placeholder value that is replaced with a corresponding value as defined in a line 23 of global.js (English). In a similar manner with respect to German lobby page 100' (see FIG. 6), the placeholder value in 1\_status.htm is replaced as defined in a line 23 of global.js (German) (paragraph block 0047), which meet the limitation of **providing the layout mapping comprises supporting a localized navigation framework for the requested page.**

**Regarding dependent claim 17,** Parasnis et al. teach that a persistent storage device, coupled to the processor and the memory, on which one or more sets of localized objects are stored (paragraph block 0012), which meet the limitation of **the means for selecting comprises means for storing the localized version.**

**Regarding dependent claims 24 – 27,** Parasnis et al. teach that all of the objects in the lower portion of lobby pages comprise localized objects that are substituted in place of placeholder values in lobby.htm based on corresponding entries in the English and German global.js files. For example, "Title:" label is rendered in English so as to display the text "Title:" in the following manner (paragraph block 0040), which meet the limitation of **a client configured to display the localized page.**

**Regarding dependent claim 21,** the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 2, and is rejected along the same rationale.

**Regarding dependent claim 22,** the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 3, and is rejected along the same rationale.

**Regarding dependent claim 23,** the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 13, and is rejected along the same rationale.

**(10) Response to Argument**

Appellant argues that Parasnis et al. do not teach **selecting a localized page based on at least one locale parameter** because Parasnis et al. teach the use of placeholders in a document and replaces the placeholders with objects and does not select or replace the document itself (pp 10 – 11).

The Office disagrees.

First, in response to appellant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of appellant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which appellant relies (i.e., selecting a localized page from a plurality of locale-versions of the page, thereby improving the efficiency of creating the pages at development time (p 11)) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Further, Parasnis et al. teach that when the markup language documents are rendered by the browser, **display pages are produced** containing localized objects that convey content in the language selected by the user (paragraph block 0008). Thus, Parasnis et al. teach the generation of localized pages, which meets the limitation of selecting a localized page based on at least one locale parameter. The language selected by the user is the locale parameter.

Appellant appears to assert that Parasnis et al. counteracts the above contention because Parasnis et al. teach that a single set of markup language documents can be used to support a plurality of different languages (p 10). Respectfully,

a single set of documents does not mean that there is only one document, but plural documents in a set as clearly depicted in Figs 2 and 3 and also Figs 5 and 6.

It should be further noted that it is inherent that the localized document or page of Parasnis et al. is selected at least for display, since Parasnis et al. teach that **display pages are produced** containing localized objects (paragraph block 0008).

Appellant argues that Parasnis et al. do not teach the limitations of claims 3, 4, and 5 because a country identifier, a locale identifier and a language identifier are different than selecting a language (p 12).

The Office disagrees.

First, the claims recite respectively **the locale parameter comprises a country identifier, the locale parameter comprises a locale variant and the locale variant comprises a language dialect identifier.**

To that end, Parasnis et al. teach that English lobby page 100 can be rendered in one of several different languages. Suppose that a German company would like to perform a presentation broadcast. Accordingly, the labels and other information on the lobby page should be rendered in the German language (paragraph block 0035). Consequently, there must be a country identifier to identify that the program or page is defined for a German company.

Similarly, Parasnis et al. teach that for example, Microsoft Corporation's word processing application program is used throughout the world, and is distributed in versions that support one of a myriad of different languages as well as **various dialects**

(paragraph block 0002). Thus, there must be a locale variant in the form of a language dialect identifier in order to support the various dialects.

Appellant argues that Parasnis et al. do not teach **the page localization generator comprises an action mapping correlating each localized page of a plurality of different locale-versions of a page to the at least one locale parameter associated with each localized page** because Parasnis et al. teach a single set of documents (p 13).

The Office disagrees.

Again, appellant is not fully appreciating the Parasnis et al. reference for all that it teaches. Parasnis et al. teach that many application programs are published in different language versions. POWERPOINT 2000<sup>TM</sup> also provides support for different languages, but does so by using the present invention. The present invention enables an HTML-based UI to support a plurality of different languages using just a single set of HTML documents (**one for each page required**) (paragraph block 0034).

Further, a single set of documents does not mean that there is only one document, but plural documents in a set as clearly depicted in Figs 2 and 3 and also Figs 5 and 6. Clearly according to the figures of Parasnis et al., the set of documents consists of GLOBAL.JS (ENGLISH) and GLOBAL.JS (GERMAN) – one for each page.

Appellant argues that Parasnis et al. do not teach **a model and a view separate from one another and separate from the controller, wherein the model is adapted**

**to provide an application state for the application and the view is adapted to provide a view presentation for the application** because the Office has equated the HTML page with placeholders to the claimed model and the rendered UI page to the claimed view (pp 14 and 15, top).

The Office disagrees.

First, it should be noted that a reference is valid for all that it teaches (MPEP 2123). Appellant seems to argue that the interpretation rendered by the Office is incorrect. Even if the Office agrees with appellant for the sake of argument, the appellant has proffered evidence that Parasnus et al. still meet the claimed limitation.

Specifically, Appellant on page 15 at the top states:

An HTML page with placeholder variables does not contain specific data or methods to get and set the data. In fact, as clearly stated in Parasnus, "[t]he placeholder variables are linked to localized objects through a reference file having entries populated with localized objects that are extracted from a dynamic link library (dll) file based on a language selected by a user." Parasnus et al., paragraph [0008].

Consequently, appellant has proven that Parasnus et al. still teaches the claimed limitation, the model, despite the alleged misinterpretation on the part of the Office. In other words, the reference file taught by Parasnus et al. meets the claimed model.

Appellant argues that Parasnus et al. do not teach **providing the page localization manager comprises providing a filename format having a basename and at least one locale-identifying extension to the basename** because Parasnus et

al. would have no reason to use locale-identifying extensions to the basename while utilizing a single set of documents (p 15).

The Office disagrees.

Parasnis et al. teach that in particular, lines 60-61 of I\_status.htm reference an UPDATE\_MESG placeholder value that is replaced as defined in a line 23 of global.js (English). In a similar manner with respect to German lobby page 100' (see FIG. 6), the UPDATE\_MESG placeholder value in 1\_status.htm is replaced as defined in a line 23 of global.js (German) (paragraph block 0047).

Appellant argues that Parasnis et al. do not teach **providing the page localization manager comprises providing a layout mapping that identifies a locale-version of a layout for the requested page from a plurality of localized layouts** because Parasnis et al. do not teach layouts for the HTML documents (p 16).

The Office disagrees.

Parasnis et al. clearly illustrates layouts for the HTML pages in Figs 5 and 6. Style.css associated with the particular GLOBAL.JS – English or German represent localized layouts (paragraph block 0055).

#### **(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nathan Hillary/

Examiner, Art Unit 2176

Conferees:

*/Doug Hutton/*  
Doug Hutton  
Supervisory Primary Examiner  
Technology Center 2100

*/Rachna Singh/*  
Rachna Singh  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2176